

# **Markscheme**

**November 2015**

**History route 2**

**Higher level**

**Paper 3 – aspects of the history  
of Europe and the Middle East**

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.

Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. **For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate's work please contact your team leader.**

<b>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused, with a high degree of awareness of the question, and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.
<b>15–17:</b>	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
<b>12–14:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
<b>9–11:</b>	Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
<b>7–8:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. There is an attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
<b>5–6:</b>	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
<b>3–4:</b>	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
<b>1–2:</b>	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.

Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the **“best fit”** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**. If an answer indicates that the demands of the question are understood and addressed but that **not all implications are considered (eg, compare or contrast; reasons or significance; methods or success)**, then examiners should not be afraid of using the full range of marks allowed for by the markscheme: *ie*, responses that offer good coverage of some of the criteria should be rewarded accordingly.

## The French Revolution and Napoleon – mid 18th century to 1815

1. “... the Revolution devours [destroys] its children” (Jacques Mallet du Pan). To what extent does this statement describe the career of Robespierre?

The candidates are not expected to discuss or assess the quotation or Mallet du Pan, instead, they are invited to use the quotation as a starting point for a discussion of the career of Maximilien Robespierre. Answers that simply give narratives of the French Revolution or that discuss whether Robespierre was justified in his actions are unfocused on the question.

### *Indicative content*

- Robespierre was elected to the Estates General in 1789 as Representative for Arras.
- He was prominent in the Jacobin Club and influential in debates during the trial of Louis XVI.
- His main role was in the Committee of Public Safety from July 1793. Many thousands were executed during the *Terror*. Robespierre was a key public figure, nicknamed The Great Incorruptible.
- In July 1794 the Thermidorean Reaction occurred and Robespierre was overthrown and executed.
- Candidates may argue that the Revolution brought Robespierre to power and he was destroyed by a reaction against the revolutionary forces he unleashed (and thus they would agree with the quotation).
- They may also argue that the quotation is more accurate for Marat, Hébert and Danton, who came to prominence during the revolution and were executed on the order of the Committee of Public Safety in spring 1794.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

2. To what extent were the Napoleonic wars caused by the desire to spread revolutionary ideals?

Candidates are required to examine the causes of the Napoleonic wars and they should attempt to identify how significant the desire to spread revolutionary ideals was amongst these. The main focus of responses should be a consideration of the motivation of the French and their opponents in waging war in the period c1799–1815 and candidates should avoid simple descriptions of events.

*Indicative content*

- Napoleon came to power in a revolutionary France that had challenged European monarchies since April 1792. He claimed that he was bringing the benefits of French revolutionary rule to those ruled by repressive monarchies.
- In some areas of Europe, French rule gained some acceptance, for example in parts of Italy and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. However, the often abusive nature of French occupation, for example in Germany and Spain, met with hostility and argues against the contention of the question.
- Napoleon's increased power and his expansion across Europe were arguably not in accordance with French revolutionary principles.
- A possible approach would be to point out that the Napoleonic wars have been interpreted, both at the time and since, as geopolitical conflicts in which France attempted to become the dominant power in Europe, just as it had been under Louis XIV a hundred years earlier.
- Candidates could also underline that the coalitions facing France varied over time with Russia, Austria and Prussia allied with Napoleon at times, seemingly undermining the importance of ideology. Britain's commercial and colonial rivalry with France predated the Napoleonic wars and, in its origins, had little to do with ideology.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

### Unification and consolidation of Germany and Italy 1815–1890

3. “Foreign powers were far more influential in the unification of Italy than they were in the unification of Germany.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

In their responses candidates should analyse both German and Italian unification, although there need not be an equal split in terms of the amount of time spent on each. The main events of both unifications should be well known as should the role of foreign powers and candidates should attempt to address how significant the actions of foreign powers were when compared to other factors.

#### *Indicative content*

##### **Italy:**

- Napoleon III signed the Pact of Plombières with Cavour in 1858 and then led France into war against Austria. This in turn led to the battles of Solferino and Magenta. He then withdrew from the war by the treaty of Villafranca in 1859.
- Prussia played a role in 1866 in allying with Piedmont against Austria in the Seven Weeks War.
- British public opinion and policy was broadly sympathetic to Italian unification throughout the 1850s and 1860s.

##### **Germany:**

- Foreign powers played a more limited role here; the role of France in 1870 to 1871 was, in effect, to mobilize the South German states behind Prussia and the North German Federation.
- Again, British foreign policy was generally sympathetic and had little role in influencing events.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

4. Evaluate the reasons for the establishment of the Dual Monarchy of Austria Hungary in 1867.

Candidates should appraise the reasons for the establishment of the Dual Monarchy in Austria at the given time. They may choose to briefly summarize its provisions and address if these tackled any issues or underlying problems; for example, they may address the extent to which there was autonomy of the Hungarian part of the empire under the overall authority of the Emperor and the rationale for this. Overall, candidates should focus on the reasons for the establishment of the Dual Monarchy and not go too far beyond 1867 in their coverage of events.

*Indicative content*

- In 1848/1849, the Austrian Empire had faced and overcome a series of Liberal and nationalist revolutions in its territories; for example, in Milan, Venice and most seriously in Budapest. It was perhaps only Russian intervention in 1849 that allowed Austria to reassert control over the Hungarian capital.
- Austrian international prestige declined after 1849. French intervention in 1859 meant that Austria lost Lombardy to Piedmont. In 1866, Austria was defeated by Prussia in the Seven Weeks War. The war ended the last vestiges of Austrian power in Italy with the loss of Venetia; the implication of the defeat was also that Austria was expelled from a Prussian-dominated Germany.
- These factors contributed to the reorientation of the empire to the east and the need to come to terms with the Hungarians; hence the Dual Monarchy was created.
- Another important reason for the creation of the Dual Monarchy was the willingness of sections of the Hungarian leadership to come to terms with Austria. Many Hungarians could see the benefits of retaining a link with Austria while having a free hand to rule the mainly Slav minorities within their part of the Dual Monarchy.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Ottoman Empire from the early 19th to the early 20th century

### 5. Examine the consequences of the Crimean War for the Ottoman Empire.

Candidates must demonstrate a clear understanding of how the Crimean War had an impact on the Empire both internally and on its international position. They may, where relevant, draw parallels or highlight differences between the domestic and international impact of the war. They should attempt to reach a supported judgment on the overall outcome of the war on the Ottoman Empire.

#### *Indicative content*

- The immediate consequences (terms of the Treaty of Paris, 1856) were the demilitarisation of the Black Sea (on the Ottoman and Russian sides), an end to Russian influence in Moldavia and Wallachia and a formal guarantee of the Ottoman Empire's independence and integrity by all the main European powers.
- However, the European powers continued to intervene; for example, France in Lebanon in 1860. This intervention led to the creation of an autonomous province out of the mainly Christian parts of Lebanon. Disraeli and Bismarck reversed territorial losses at the Congress of Berlin (June 1878).
- In domestic affairs, some candidates may argue that European pressure linked to the Crimean War led to reform and better treatment of Christian minorities. Others may argue that reform in the Ottoman Empire predated the Crimean War (for example the 1839 reforms) and that the war had little effect.
- Candidates may also wish to argue that the Crimean War was only a temporary respite for the Ottoman Empire, given the crisis of 1873 to 1878 and military defeat by the Russians in 1877. Although the Congress of Berlin curtailed the Russian gains that had been set out in the Treaty of San Stefano (March 1878), the Ottoman Empire was still seriously weakened.
- The Empire continued to lose territory as Romania, Serbia and Montenegro gained their independence and Bulgaria its autonomy.
- The immediate consequences appeared beneficial for the Ottoman Empire; however, events from the mid-1870s could be used to support an argument that the Crimean War had few lasting consequences for the Ottoman Empire.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*



6. Evaluate the short-term **and** long-term reasons for the overthrow of Abdul Hamid in 1909.

In their responses, candidates should appraise the reasons for the overthrow of Abdul Hamid and they may wish to address the nature of and differences between the long-term and short-term causes of his deposition. The nature of his overthrow in 1909 should be examined and candidates should, where possible, draw links between the event and the factors that led to it.

*Indicative content*

- In July 1908 military officers of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) rebelled in Macedonia and Thrace, demanding the restoration of the 1876 constitution, with elections taking place at the end of 1908. Abdul Hamid remained as sultan; however, his position was weakened.
- A brief counter-revolution took place in April 1909, but the CUP was able to suppress it within 12 days. Following this, Abdul Hamid was deposed by parliament and replaced with his younger brother who became Sultan Mehmet V.
- Short-term reasons include rising prices, arrears in payment of military officers' salaries and the Reval meeting between Edward VII of Britain and Nicholas II of Russia in June 1908. At this meeting there had been a proposal for foreign control of Macedonia, leaving the Ottoman Empire with only nominal control.
- Longer-term political reasons could include the revocation of the 1876 constitution, the growth of political opposition and its links with military officers in the Empire's European provinces.
- Another long term cause could be the progressive loss of territory in Europe throughout the 19th century. As for long-term economic causes, candidates could refer to the rise of cheap industrial imports into the Empire, for example from Britain, with which local handicraft industries could not compete.
- Some candidates may also examine the events of April 1909, which led directly to the overthrow of Abdul Hamid; these are likely to be analysed under short-term reasons. Some CUP officers believed that the Sultan had encouraged the April counter-revolution, although he denied it. The Liberal opposition and conservative religious figures are more likely to have instigated the counter-revolution. The strength of the CUP within the army determined that the counterrevolution would be a short-lived affair.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914

7. “The Empire of Napoleon III was politically stable – it was military defeat that caused its downfall.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?

The main focus of this question is to analyse the strength and stability of the Second Empire and to ascertain the reasons for its downfall. Candidates may examine a range of interpretations; however, the empire’s alleged political stability and the effects of its military defeat should be key elements of the discussion.

### *Indicative content*

- Prussian/German forces defeated and captured Napoleon III at the battle of Sedan in September 1870; shortly afterwards the French parliament deposed him and declared the Third Republic.
- There are two main approaches to these events. One is to argue in line with the quotation that it was only military defeat in 1870 that ended the Second Empire. Points in favour of this argument may stress that, by 1869, reforms had created the “Liberal Empire”, the lack of a united opposition to Napoleon III and the completely catastrophic nature of the military defeat in 1870.
- On the other hand, there are arguments the other way. Candidates could argue that from the early 1860s, the regime was in decline. They may point to the decline in support for the Second Empire in the elections of 1863 and 1869, compared with elections in the 1850s. They may also point to the growing strength of opposition especially in Paris and they may argue that war with Bismarck was a desperate attempt by Napoleon III to shore up his domestic support.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

8. “Continuity was the dominant theme in 19th-century politics.” Discuss with reference to any **one** Western European **or** Northern European state.

Candidates should offer a considered review of the statement and attempt to outline both areas of continuity and change in their chosen state in order to reach a balanced judgment. They may examine their chosen state’s domestic or foreign policy or a combination of both of these and should seek to address the extent to which the focus of that policy was unchanged.

**Note:** The Ottoman Empire and Russia (unless specifically focused on the Grand Duchy of Finland) are not Northern or Western European states and are not valid examples for the purposes of this question.

*Indicative content*

- Those candidates who elect to discuss **Britain** could infer that there was much continuity in terms of foreign policy, for example, the maintenance of the Balance of Power in Europe, or they could argue that there was limited progress in terms of social reform given the wider changes that society experienced. On the other hand they could assert that change was more important given the significant extension in the franchise over the course of the 19th century.
- Other candidates may elect to focus their responses on **Spain**, and for this one could argue against the question given the numerous political upheavals in the 19th century. However, a contrary argument could be made that the underlying structure of power remained little changed throughout the period.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Imperial Russia, revolutions, emergence of Soviet State 1853–1924

9. “The reigns of Alexander II and Alexander III had more similarities than differences.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates are expected to consider the merits or otherwise of the given statement. They should analyse carefully both reigns and compare and contrast what was planned and what was achieved before arriving at a substantiated judgment.

### *Indicative content*

#### **Similarities:**

- Both tsars were determined to maintain the autocratic structure: Alexander II emancipated the serfs to prevent revolution from below whilst the establishment of the zemstva and Duma were seen as a means of extending the power of the state.
- Alexander III made clear in his accession manifesto his aim of maintaining the autocracy. He replaced Justices of the Peace with Land Captains, revised the franchise, strengthened censorship and strengthened the Third Section.
- Alexander II had also, in the middle period of his reign, become fairly reactionary. Even the proposed Loris-Melikov reforms were limited.
- Both pursued a policy of Russification to try and control the various national groups in the Empire.
- Both were keen to develop and modernize Russia’s economy.

#### **Differences:**

- Alexander III was more successful in developing Russian industry with Witte’s encouragement of foreign investment.
- Alexander III’s policies with regard to the peasants were more successful. Emancipation had left the peasants with Redemption Dues to pay and there was continued unrest.
- Alexander III reduced the amount of poll tax paid and set up Land Banks, which began to resolve the problem of peasant poverty.
- Alexander II looked to the West for inspiration whereas Alexander III was very much a traditional Slavophile.
- Alexander II was considering constitutional change by 1881; however, Alexander III was completely opposed to it throughout his reign.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**10. Evaluate the successes and failures of Lenin's foreign policy between 1917 and 1924.**

Candidates must demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the question and should appraise Lenin's foreign policy during the set period. The focus of the question is Bolshevik Russia's relationship with other states and not internal events in Russia. The aims of Lenin's foreign policy were, ideally, to expand revolution; however, when this was clearly not going to happen, his foreign policy became much more pragmatic and was driven by the conditions in Russia. Candidates should aim to provide a considered judgment on the overall success or failure of Lenin's policies in this regard.

*Indicative content*

**Successes:**

- Making peace with the Germans; the conclusion of an armistice in December 1919 followed by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918.
- 1921 Trade Agreements with both Britain and Germany.
- Treaty of Rapallo (1922), which attracted German investment to the Soviet Union. Germany was the first nation to establish diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia.
- In 1924 Russia gained recognition from Great Britain, France and Italy, as such, there was some normalization of relations. Candidates may argue that this was very fragile as evidenced by the row over the Zinoviev letter.

**Failures:**

- Brest-Litovsk could arguably be considered a failure as it was so punitive (Russia lost 32 per cent of its population, 34 per cent of its agriculture and 54 per cent of its industrial capacity) and Lenin was heavily criticized for signing it. It also alienated the Allies and contributed to their intervention in the civil war.
- The establishment of Comintern (1919) increased hostility to the new Russian state.
- The Russo-Polish War (1920–1921) was an attempt to spread communism in Poland and it failed; the Red Army was defeated and the Treaty of Riga clearly established Poland as an independent state, which meant the loss of territory.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the **"best fit"** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## European diplomacy and the First World War 1870–1923

### 11. To what extent was the decline of the Ottoman Empire the main cause of the First World War?

In their responses, candidates should consider the merits or otherwise of the statement and should seek to achieve a balanced conclusion. Ottoman decline could be considered a main cause as it led to instability in the Balkans; however, it is also possible to argue against the importance of Ottoman decline as a cause for the First World War in a number of ways. For example, candidates could refer to German policy after 1890, the alliance system and general militarism in Europe as more important than events in the Ottoman Empire in causing the war.

#### *Indicative content*

- The Italian attack on Ottoman Libya in 1911 underlined the weakness of the Ottoman Empire and led to the Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913.
- As a result of these conflicts, Serbia was strengthened and Austria-Hungary was determined to try and reduce her power.
- The murder of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June 1914 provided the Austrians with the perfect opportunity. Russia supported Serbia and Germany supported Austria-Hungary. France supported Russia and the German invasion of Belgium arguably meant that Britain had to become involved.
- Over the longer term, one could also argue that Ottoman decline in the Balkans led to increased competition in the region between Russia and Austria-Hungary (the latter backed by Germany), as both empires competed for influence. The Austro-Hungarian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 perhaps made Russia more determined not to back down in future Balkan crises including that of July 1914.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

12. With reference to any **two** European countries, compare and contrast the impact on women of the First World War.

Candidates must discuss the similarities and differences between their two chosen countries in terms of the impact that the First World War had on the role and position of women in society. The focus of responses could be on long and/or short-term effects, but there should be ongoing reference to the chosen countries throughout. Candidates may reach a substantiated judgment on the extent of the similarities and differences and argue that one was more significant than the other. Germany and Britain are likely to be the most frequently chosen exemplars; however accept any other relevant choices.

*Indicative content*

**Comparison:**

- In both cases women entered new areas of employment, for example munitions.
- Women experienced a decline in their standards of living, for example, through rationing or the Turnip Winter.
- The social impact of the Lost Generation could be mentioned, for example, war widows and unmarried women.
- Some women, such as Rosa Luxemburg and Sylvia Pankhurst, opposed the war, although the majority of women are thought to have supported it.
- In the years following the war, women were granted suffrage.

**Contrast:**

- Arguably British women were mobilized to a greater extent, for example, in Voluntary Aid Detachments (VADs), factories, and jobs in public transport.
- Women were more politically active in post-war Germany than they were in post-war Britain; 49 women were elected to the Reichstag in 1919 whereas in the 1918 election in the United Kingdom only one woman was elected and she did not take up her seat.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## War and change in the Middle East 1914–1949

13. To what extent was Jewish immigration the main contributor to instability in Palestine in the years 1917 to 1939?

Candidates must consider the merits of the statement by analysing a range of causes for the instability in Palestine in the given period and by assessing the extent to which the issue of Jewish immigration was dominant amongst these factors.

### *Indicative content*

- Candidates may mention the conflicting wartime promises to Palestinians and Jews, and discuss the Hussein-McMahon correspondence, Sykes-Picot Agreement and the Balfour Declaration.
- There could be discussion of religious tensions, such as riots in Jaffa or the Wailing Wall riots (1929).
- Economic disparity could also be mentioned; Jews tended to be more affluent than Palestinians, had higher-level jobs and more education. The issue of Land Purchase could also be a factor linked to this economic disparity.
- The growth of an Arab/Palestinian national consciousness in the period increased the Palestinians' resentment of British control.
- Changing British policies could also be addressed. Candidates may refer to the various White Papers and Commissions that the British implemented, which at times seemed to favour the Jews and at others the Palestinians, and led to tensions and unrest.
- With regard to immigration, there should be some knowledge of the levels of immigration. It was relatively small in the 1920s and at times more Jews left the mandate than arrived. The 1930s saw an increase for two key reasons: the US limitations on immigration and, after 1933, the impact of Nazi policies in Germany. By 1939 Jews made up a third of the population.
- Candidates may argue that the Mandate was relatively peaceful in the 1920s that the Arab revolt of 1936 was a response to immigration but the focus of the Revolt was also the British administration.
- The situation in the mandate with the conflicting demands of Zionism and growing Arab nationalism were exacerbated by a range of complex factors with immigration being one of the most obvious, but not the only one.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*



14. To what extent was religion the most important influence on the establishment and consolidation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia?

Candidates must consider a range of factors that influenced the establishment and consolidation of the Saudi Arabian regime and consider the extent to which the issue of religion was pre-eminent amongst these.

*Indicative content*

**Establishment:**

- The region that became Saudi Arabia did not become a Mandate as other Ottoman territories did because the British and French were fully aware of the importance of Mecca and Medina and any attempt to assert western control would cause problems in other parts of their empires.
- Sharif Hussein was unpopular because of his inability to establish stability in the Holy cities.
- The House of Saud was closely linked to Wahhabism and Saud was able to use the Ikwhan (military) to expel leaders such as Sharif Hussein from the area. By 1927 Ibn Saud was the King of the Hejaz and, with British agreement, was able to establish the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia by 1932.

**Consolidation:**

- Ibn Saud was popular because of his links to the Muslim revival and because of his restoration of order and continued protection of the Holy Cities.
- Muslim clerics spreading Wahhabism helped to unite the former tribal groupings that had dominated the area.
- There was no separation of religion and the state, religion formed the basis of all institutions from the Constitution to the legal structure, which was based on Sharia law.
- Ibn Saud combined the role of both religious and political leader and the Ulema had political influence.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Interwar years: conflict and cooperation 1919–1939

15. “In the years 1922 to 1939 Mussolini’s foreign policy was a disaster for Italy.” Discuss.

Candidates must offer a considered and balanced review of the statement and, with reference to the whole period in the question, they should assess and evaluate the successes and failures of Mussolini’s foreign policy before arriving at a substantiated judgment. Some candidates may extend their analysis to include the rationale for Italian entry into the Second World War.

### *Indicative content*

- In the 1920s Mussolini’s foreign policy was reasonably successful in that Italy was on good terms with the major powers, save for the Corfu incident.
- Much was achieved via diplomacy: the question of Fiume was settled and Italian influence was extended to the Balkans. Treaties with Austria and Hungary, Italian involvement in the Locarno Agreements and Rome Protocols and the Stresa Front all seemed to indicate Italy’s importance in international affairs. In 1934, Mussolini moved troops to the Brenner Pass to prevent a Nazi takeover in Austria with the support of other powers.
- The Abyssinian Crisis marked a change both in methods and relations with the major powers. Mussolini was furious at the condemnation of the League of Nations, and the failure of the Hoare-Laval Pact. The imposition of sanctions made him turn towards Nazi Germany and, in 1936, resulted in the Rome–Berlin Axis, the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1937, acceptance of the Anschluss in 1938, cooperation in Spain and the Pact of Steel in 1939.
- However, Italy’s military was also weak because of the waste of resources in Spain and Abyssinia. Initially Italy adopted Non-Belligerent status when war broke out but in 1940 the country entered the war. Italy did not have the resources to fight and involvement in the war led to defeat and invasion from both the Allies and the Germans.
- It is difficult to disagree that Mussolini’s foreign policy was ultimately a disaster but, in the 1920s, it could be regarded as reasonably beneficial for Italy.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**16.** To what extent was Germany economically and politically stable by 1929?

The key focus is the relative strength of the political structure and the economy – had they really stabilized and recovered from the immediate post-war crises? Analysis should consider the extent to which apparent weakness was really the case. For example, coalition governments are not always a sign of political instability.

**Note:** Answers may well set the context by referring to attempts to overthrow the republic, for example, the Spartacus Revolt, Kapp Putsch and Munich Putsch, the frequent changes of government and the levels of political violence (assassination of Rathenau and other politicians). Economic problems were inflation, hyperinflation and Reparations.

*Indicative content*

- The main focus of responses should be the “Golden Years”. Stresemann was the dominant politician during this period and governments were coalitions of pro-Weimar parties. There were no attempted coups and the election of Hindenburg as president in 1925 satisfied the nationalist Right. The Nazis had a declining share of the vote at just over 2 per cent in 1928, so arguably politics had reached a level of stability with voters mostly supporting pro-Weimar parties.
- Economically, Germany had recovered from hyperinflation thanks to the introduction of the Rentenmark, which was then followed by a new currency, the Reichsmark. The Dawes and Young Plans seemed to be making the problem of reparations less onerous. Foreign investment contributed to some industrial growth and German exports had grown. However, there were budget deficits because of welfare spending and there was a balance of trade deficit. Foreign investment was short-term and insecure and the agricultural sector experienced a recession from 1926. It could be argued that despite the apparent prosperity of these years the economy was essentially unstable.
- Candidates may argue that “Germany was dancing on the edge of a volcano”, being inherently politically and economically unstable and the Depression was the last straw.
- Alternatively, they may argue that Germany was relatively politically stable, possibly less so economically and it was the Depression that destroyed that stability and caused politics to become polarized.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe 1924–2000

17. “Collectivization in the Soviet Union was carried out for political reasons.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates must ascertain the merits or otherwise of this statement by examining the rationale behind the policy of collectivization in the Soviet Union and not its successes/failures or the cost in human terms. The policy needs to be set in the context of conditions in the Soviet Union. By 1929, when the policy of Collectivization emerged concurrently with Five Year Plans, it was clear that the New Economic Policy (NEP) had failed to solve economic problems. There were food shortages and industrial growth had slowed. Stalin argued for the need to firmly establish “Socialism in one country”.

### *Indicative content*

- Candidates may refer to political factors, such as the desire to remove the elements of capitalism that had been allowed under NEP, for example the aim to fully establish a command economy similar to War Communism.
- Stalin needed to secure adequate food supplies for the industrial workers to maintain support for the Five Year Plans.
- Dekulakization – the removal of slightly more prosperous (not rich) citizens would remove a potentially bourgeois class.
- Using the 25,000 Party cadres to enforce collectivization would extend the influence of the central Party to rural areas. Local commissars were in charge of ensuring quotas were met and party loyalists became kolkhoz managers. Also, the need to meet targets increased control of the peasant population.
- Economic factors may also be referred to, such as the need to improve agricultural production to provide a surplus that could then fund industrial growth and thus modernize the Soviet economy.
- Adequate supplies would ensure prices in the towns and cities remained stable.
- Candidates could argue that it is difficult to separate the economic from the political, that collectivization, like the Five Year Plans, aimed to complete the revolution (the Great Breakthrough) and also to strengthen the Soviet Union’s ability to withstand external threats.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

**18. Examine the view that Brezhnev's domestic policies had a very limited impact on the Soviet Union.**

Candidates must consider the nature of Brezhnev's domestic policies and assess them in the context of their effect on the Soviet Union. Whilst the overall focus of the question is the impact of the Brezhnev era inside the Soviet Union reference to foreign policy could be made relevant when considering its impact on the economy.

*Indicative content*

- The Politburo led the move to recentralize control of the state via the Party.
- Economic policies maintained wage differentials and profit incentives for workers; there was some improvement in the standard of living by 1980; rents and food prices were low and throughout the decade ownership of consumer goods such as fridges and televisions became commonplace. Fifteen per cent of the gross national product was spent on the military.
- There was increased support for agriculture, with larger kolkhoz being formed to increase productivity (there was some success in increasing cereal production but still not meeting targets) but other crops declined. In 1977 and 1981 expansion of private plots of kolkhozniks led to increased production but this was only 4 per cent of cultivated land.
- Industrial production was in need of modernization and from 1970 there was little growth particularly in key industries such as coal and oil.
- The population was growing but the building industry was very inefficient and this led to most Russians living in cramped conditions.
- There was an early clampdown on dissidents as the KGB regained some influence. The persecution of leading dissidents such as Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn was notable and by the early 1970s there were 10 000 political prisoners, often in mental institutions; however repression was nowhere near the scale of Stalin's purges.
- Essentially the Brezhnev period was one of stagnation on many levels with the leadership unwilling to make any significant changes. The impact on the Soviet Union was largely negative with little or no economic growth, relatively poor standards of living with some aspects declining (both healthcare and education needed improvement) because of government inertia.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the **"best fit"** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## The Second World War and post-war Western Europe 1939–2000

19. With reference to **one** Western European state in the period 1945 to 1949, to what extent do you agree that national debt was the greatest problem it faced following the end of the Second World War?

This question provides candidates with an opportunity to consider their national history. Answers should be supported with specific and detailed references to their chosen state. The scale of problems will vary from country to country and not all are applicable. One common feature is a lack of capital to address major problems, the solution was Marshall Aid, which was a series of grants and not loans and thus, unlike post-First World War debt, was not a major issue in recovering from the war.

### *Indicative content*

- Candidates may refer to the physical devastation caused by the conflict, for example, both Axis and Allied powers had bombed major cities in various countries.
- Agricultural production was affected by military campaigns after 1944 leading to food shortages and rationing in most countries.
- Homelessness may also be a referenced issue – 30 per cent of housing stock was destroyed in Britain, 20 per cent in France and there were similar statistics in other countries.
- Humanitarian problems were a consequence in many areas, refugees, displaced persons because of population movements, orphans and/or concentration camp survivors could all be referenced.
- Economic and trading problems are another legitimate area for discussion; countries needed to revert to a peacetime economy (during the war 50 per cent of Britain's gross national product had been directed to the war effort) and in occupied countries such as France and the Netherlands the economies had been organized to support the German war effort. Currencies were often valueless and most countries had a trade deficit with the US.
- The establishment of a legitimate state structure in former occupied countries, which could then address problems, may be discussed. This was more difficult for countries such as France and Italy than it was for the Netherlands where there had been a government in exile during the war.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

20. With reference to the period 1945 to 1955, examine the consequences for Germany of Cold War tensions.

Candidates must demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the question and effectively deploy knowledge of the key issue(s) raised by the question. The focus is how Cold War tensions affected Germany, in both East and West in the ten years after the Second World War.

*Indicative content*

- There was a loss of territory to Poland because of Stalin's determination to establish a buffer zone.
- There were also difficulties in administering occupied Germany due to the lack of cooperation between the occupying powers. Food and fuel shortages affected the whole country.
- It was difficult to stabilize the German economy; there were disagreements over the issue of reparations and these led to the western powers forming Bizonia and then Trizonia and issuing a new currency, the Deutschmark.
- Cold War tensions shaped Stalin's attempts to drive the western powers out of Berlin by imposing the Berlin Blockade, which had a significant impact on conditions for Berliners.
- By 1949, there had been separation of the Soviet and Western zones into two separate states; the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) and the German Democratic Republic (East Germany).
- Between 1949 and 1955 West Germany became increasingly integrated into the European economy, for example, it joined the European Coal and Steel Community. It was allowed to re-arm and join NATO and this placed it firmly in the western camp.
- East Germany was theoretically independent but under Soviet control (Soviet troops were used to control the 1953 demonstrations in Berlin). East Germany was economically linked to the Soviet Union via the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) and by membership of the Warsaw Pact.
- Thus by 1955 Cold War tensions had divided Germany into the capitalist West and Sovietized East.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the "**best fit**" to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Post-war developments in the Middle East 1945–2000

### 21. Examine the nature of the Egyptian state under Nasser.

This question requires candidates to consider the political and governmental structure, as well as the economic and, where relevant, social structure of the Egyptian state during the set period. Some responses could conclude that it was a dynamic state that changed Egypt significantly, whereas other answers may extend this and suggest that changes were surface only, and beneath the facade there were not significant advancements.

#### *Indicative content*

- Under Nasser, Egypt was a one party state with him as virtual dictator supported by the military.
- It was a nationalist state as well as a reformist one, for example, there was land reform and nationalization of the Suez Canal.
- Egypt was also a populist state, as Nasser enjoyed immense support from the peasantry.
- However, it was also a repressive state where the imprisonment of opposition leaders was common, and there was state control of the media.
- Furthermore, there were some elements of socialism with significant public ownership and control of the economy.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*



**22.** To what extent did Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi modernize and westernize Iran?

Candidates must consider the merits or otherwise of the suggestion that Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi had a transformative impact on Iran. The focus of the response should be on the extent of change brought about by the Shah's policies on Iranian society, economy and politics. Candidates may well argue that the extent of change was very limited and superficial and that it affected the better-off but not the greater proportion of the population.

*Indicative content*

- Politically Iran was undemocratic; martial law was in place until 1957, opposition parties were disbanded, and the Iranian Organization of Intelligence and National Security (SAVAK) was active and powerful.
- Economically however, Iran was very much linked to the west with Britain and the US having huge interests in the Iranian oil industry. There was significant trade with the west especially with the US, with the purchase of military equipment and there were significant numbers of western advisers in Iran. However, these were very much limited to urban areas and to specific economic activities.
- In 1963, the White Revolution aimed to, amongst other things, grant land reform, increase literacy rates and promote industrialization. Responses should consider the extent to which these reforms spread throughout Iranian society.
- Other exemplars of westernization could include, women's suffrage, family law reform and dress regulation.
- Most of the changes were limited to the cities, especially Tehran, and rural areas were still very conservative and dominated by the Ulema. Throughout the period in question, Iran did not develop a balanced economy and it was still heavily reliant on oil.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the **"best fit"** to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

## Social and economic developments in Europe and the Middle East in the 19th or 20th century

23. With reference to a period of approximately fifty years, to what extent has there been continuity in the status of women in **one** country of the region?

Candidates should provide specific detailed material in their analysis of the status of women in their chosen country and should avoid broad generalizations. Whilst the fifty year range is approximate, responses must deal with an extended period of time, rather than focus on far shorter periods, for example Germany during the Third Reich. The question gives candidates the opportunity to use material from their own national histories should they elect to do so.

### *Indicative content*

- Candidates could argue that there has been continuity or that there has been great change to the status of women and their responses could focus on access to education, employment, property rights and the voting franchise.
- For some countries, arguments could be made that despite apparent change, the status of women did not become equal to that of men. This may suggest, although it does not necessarily dictate, that there has been a great deal of continuity for these cases.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*

24. With reference to a period of approximately fifty years, evaluate the reasons for demographic change in **one** country of the region.

Candidates must select a relevant state and appraise the rationale for demographic change in that country. Whilst the fifty year range is approximate, responses must deal with an extended period of time, rather than focus on far shorter periods, for example the immediate aftermath of the Second World War. This question should give candidates the opportunity to use material from their own national histories.

### *Indicative content*

- Reasons for demographic change could include; decline in mortality, increasing mechanization in agriculture reducing the need for a large rural workforce, female education, growing access to contraception and more general improvements in healthcare and standards of living.
- Candidates may discuss the demographic transition in their chosen country and those who examine the later periods may well choose to discuss the impact of an ageing population.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates may elect to write about in their responses. However, it is not exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

*Examiners and moderators are reminded of the need to apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and to **award credit wherever it is possible to do so**.*